

REMARKS

The Examiner stated that “the reply filed on 2/12/2007 is not fully responsive to the prior Office Action because of the following omission(s) or matter(s): The amendment filed on 02/12/2007 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.121 and the previous office letter mailed on 1/16/2007” as discussed next.

The Examiner objected to claims 6, 12, 15, 21, 24, 29, 40, and 47-49.

In response, Applicants have canceled claims 6, 12, 15, 21, 24, 29, 40, and 47-49.

The Examiner argues: “Claim 1 at line 12 "image transmission portions" should be "the image transmission portions" since "image transmission portions" are previously presented in the claim.”

In response, Applicants have amended claim 1 in accordance with the Examiner’s suggestion.

The Examiner argues: “Claim 2 at line 2 "image transmission portions" should be "the image transmission portions" since "image transmission portions" are previously presented in the parent claim in the newly added simulation browser limitations”.

In response, Applicants have amended claim 2 in accordance with the Examiner’s suggestion

The Examiner argues: “Claim 8 at step d) has the same issue that claim 1 has”.

In response, Applicants have amended claim 8 in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion for claim 1.

The Examiner argues: "Claim 14 at line 9 has the same issue that claim 1 has".

In response, Applicants have amended claim 14 in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion for claim 1.

The Examiner argues: "Claim 23 at line 13 has the same issue that claim 1 has".

In response, Applicants have amended claim 23 in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion for claim 1.


The Examiner argues: "Claim 35 in step b)i) "a image transmission portion" should refer to one of the previously claimed " image transmission portions" and similarly in step A "an image transmission portion" should refer to one of the previously claimed "image transmission portions""

In response, Applicants have amended claim 35 in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion.

CONCLUSION

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully believe that all pending claims and the entire application meet the acceptance criteria for allowance and therefore request favorable action. If the Examiner believes that anything further would be helpful to place the application in better condition for allowance, Applicants invites the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below. The Director is hereby authorized to charge and/or credit Deposit Account 09-0465 (IBM).

Date: 05/10/2007



Jack P. Friedman
Registration No. 44,688

Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts
22 Century Hill Drive - Suite 302
Latham, New York 12110
(518) 220-1850